

Remarks

The following is a response to the Office Action dated September 10, 2003.

Independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Fukaya U.S. patent 6,226,590. Dependent claims 3 and 28 were also anticipatorily rejected over Fukaya under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

An inventive aspect of independent claims 1-2, 4-6 and 27 relates to the display positions of plural pieces of information brought into a one-to-one correspondence with numeric keys, using a hyperlink. This aspect of the invention relates to the first embodiment and is best shown in Figs. 14-16 and disclosed on pages 37-48 of the specification. By pressing the numeric key of the file as displayed in Fig. 14 [file 1401, 1402], a full screen display of a display image such as those shown in Fig. 16 that corresponds to the numeric key is displayed on the screen.

Fukaya '590 does not teach or suggest such inventive aspect of a one-to-one correspondence among plural pieces of information and numeric keys. Fukaya does disclose a display 12 that includes a touch switch 11. However, as disclosed in column 3, lines 12-15, the touch switch 11 is part of an input/output unit 1, and is used to input for example the destination for the trip. In Column 3, lines 36-44, Fukaya '590 discloses "The display screens include screens displaying buttons on the main screen for setting the route guidance, for the route being guided, and for switching the screen." In column 3, lines 51-56, Fukaya '590 further discloses "The display 12 is equipped with touch switch 11, corresponding to the display of the function buttons, so that the aforementioned operations can be executed responsive to signals generated by touching the

buttons. The input signal generating means, composed of the buttons and the touch switch, constitute the input portion of the input/output unit 1.” Thus, even though Fukaya ‘590 does disclose buttons on the screen, those buttons nonetheless are not numeric hyperlink buttons that correspond to different displays. Nor does Fukaya ‘590 disclose any buttons in ascending numeric order, per claims 2 and 4, or the one-to-one correspondence not being linked to the calling of another file, per claims 1 and 5. The rejection of independent claims 1-2, 4-6 and 27 by Fukaya ‘590 is therefore believed not to be sustainable. That being the case, it is also respectfully submitted that claim 3 which depends from claim 2 and claim 28 which depends from claim 1 likewise are not anticipated by Fukaya ‘590.

Independent claims 7 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Nimura et al. U.S. patent 6,266,613.

Claim 7 covers embodiment 2, and its inventive feature recites “wherein said route guidance information generating means generates route guidance information at plural guide points on the route between plural points as plural pieces of ordered information or information capable of fitting in one screen display space of said display means.” This feature is believed best shown in Fig. 25 and supported by the disclosure on pages 46 and 47.

Nimura does not provide any route guidance information at plural guide points as plural pieces of ordered information. The object of Nimura is to enable a display to show the incremental changes of a vehicle, as the vehicle travels toward its destination. (Column 2, lines 10-14 and lines 21-26) To achieve this end, Nimura shows the travel progress of a vehicle on the screen as shown in

Figs. 11a and 11b. These screens are referred to as a first remaining distance display and a second remaining distance display. (Column 3, lines 18-33 and column 12, lines 1-56) Such displays as shown in Figs. 11a and 11b of Nimura are quite different from the “plural guide points” of claim 7 which is believed to be illustrated in Fig. 25.

Claim 26 covers embodiment 3 as its inventive feature relates to “a display screen is displayed or voice guidance is performed through a hyperlink according to the present position information on the basis of the route guidance information generated”. The inventive feature is supported by the disclosure on page 54, lines 8-16.

The closest that Nimura comes to the subject matter of claim 26 is believed to be in column 7, lines 20-33 which discloses that the map data file is displayed together with the position of the vehicle. But Nimura does not disclose any voice guidance being provided. Therefore, Nimura does not anticipate claims 26.

Claims 8-14 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being obvious over Nimura; while claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being obvious over Nimura in combination with Goto US patent 6,304,820.

Insofar as Nimura fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter claimed in claim 7, and claims 8-14 and 19-21 each depend from claim 7 and therefore incorporate by reference the limitations of claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-14 and 19-21 each are not obvious over Nimura, and claims 16-18 are not obvious over the combination of Nimura and Goto.

Independent claims 22, 24, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito et al. U.S. patent 6,249,740.

Per the above amendment, claims 22, 24 and 25 have been canceled. The rejection of those claims therefore is moot. Moreover, claim 23, which depends from claim 22, has been canceled.

As for claim 29, column 15, line 40 to column 16, line 52 of Ito, as pointed out by the examiner, simply does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 29. In particular, the disclosure of Ito referred to by the examiner discloses the operations of the vehicle navigation device 100 as shown by the flow chart of Figs. 8(a) and 8(b). There is nothing in that portion of the Ito disclosure that discloses, or suggests, "the dividing of the route guidance information into plural pieces each of which has a size equal to or less than the reception capacity of the communication channel to transmit the divided information".

Claims 34-39 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ito.

Insofar as Ito fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 29, it likewise fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 34-39, each of which depends from claim 29.

The remaining pending claims, all of which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 29, were rejected as being obvious over Ito and a host of other references, the main ones being Hayashi U.S. patent 6,477,526 and the afore-discussed Nimura.

With respect to the rejection of claims 30-34 and 42 under Ito and Hayashi, Hayashi only discloses the sending of routing information, upon request, to a user terminal via a network. Yet Hayashi, like Ito, fails to disclose or suggest the dividing of that information into plural pieces smaller than the reception capacity of the terminal for transmission. Nor does Hayashi disclose the sending of a hypertext language (per claim 33). Moreover, the only “weight” disclosed in Hayashi deals with the weight of each link of the road (column 10, lines 55-59) and therefore has no bearing on the “turn cost at nameless intersections” as recited in claim 42.

As for claim 43, which depends from claim 29 and from which claims 44-47 and 50-57 depend, note that the disclosure (column 11, lines 23-67) relied upon for rejecting that claim at best discloses an user “entry means” that allows the user to input arbitrary point or destination and enroute points. There does not appear to be any disclosure of function select buttons as recited in claim 43. That being the case, it is respectfully submitted that claim 43 and those claims dependent therefrom likewise are not obvious over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and allow the pending claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

LW _____

Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
1901 N. Fort Myer Drive, Suite 501
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Phone: (703) 522-8872

Date: Dec 4 2006